

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. **CV 17-04229-R (SHK)**

Date: **June 5, 2019**

Title: ***Johnnie Darnell Cox v. City of Inglewood, et al.***

Present: The Honorable **Shashi H. Kewalramani**, United States Magistrate Judge

D. Castellanos

Deputy Clerk

Not Reported

Court Reporter

Attorney(s) Present for Plaintiff(s):

None Present

Attorney(s) Present for Defendant(s):

None Present

Proceedings (IN CHAMBERS): ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

On March 7, 2019, the Court issued its Report and Recommendation (“R&R”), recommending dismissal of all official capacity claims raised in the original complaint, with prejudice. See ECF No. 46, R&R at 23. If Plaintiff wished to continue to pursue **official** capacity claims against these individuals, Plaintiff was required to file objections to the R&R in accordance with the procedures set forth in the R&R. See Id. at 24. On May 13, 2019, the Court received what appeared to be an amended complaint filed by Plaintiff. On May 14, 2019, the Court issued its Minute Order Re: Amended Complaint wherein the Court rejected the filing because Plaintiff failed to seek leave to amend and because Plaintiff erroneously sought to include claims that the Court had recommended in its R&R dismissal with prejudice. Plaintiff was given until **May 28, 2019** to file a Motion for Leave to Amend his complaint, along with his proposed amended pleading, and to object to the R&R, if he chose to do so choose.

To date, Plaintiff has failed to file a Motion for Leave to Amend or object to the R&R within the allotted time nor has he requested an extension of time within which to do so.

Accordingly, on or before **June 14, 2019** Plaintiff is ORDERED to either (a) advise the Court that he does not desire to pursue this action; (b) if plaintiff does desire to pursue this action, show good cause in writing, if any exists, why plaintiff has not timely filed with the Court his Motion for Leave to Amend with his proposed Amended Complaint, and why the Court should not recommend that this action be dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with the Court’s prior Order; or (c) file his required documents to continue with his case.

Plaintiff is forewarned that, if he fails to do either of the provided options, the Court will deem such failure a further violation of a Court order justifying dismissal, and also deem such failure as further evidence of a lack of prosecution on Plaintiff's part.

IT IS SO ORDERED.